

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Deborah Hubbard-Sarvis, #80267,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 2:08-3580-TLW-RSC
)	
Samuel B. Glover, Benjamin Aplin,)	
Gwendolyn Bright, Lovee Watts, June)	
Shissias, James Williams, Sanco Rembert,)	
Orton Bellamy, Marlene T. McClain, J.P.)	
Hodges, John McCarroll, and Teresa A.)	
Knox,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

Plaintiff, Deborah Hubbard-Sarvis (“plaintiff”), brought this civil action, *pro se*, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1). The plaintiff filed an amended complaint adding an additional defendant on December 17, 2008. (Doc. #28). The defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on April 18, 2008. (Doc. # 13). The defendants filed an amended motion for summary judgment on December 4, 2008. (Doc. #20). The defendants filed a second motion for summary judgment on December 19, 2008. (Doc. #31). The plaintiff filed a response in opposition to the defendants’ motions on January 6, 2009, (Doc. #36-38), as well as an amended response in opposition on February 2, 2009. (Doc. #40).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Robert S. Carr to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #43). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court grant the defendants’ motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #43). The plaintiff filed objections to

the report. (Doc. #45). In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. #43).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

June 9, 2009
Florence, South Carolina